

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 18-27, and 35-37 are pending in this application. No claims are amended, canceled or added. In view of the following remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Examiner has finally rejected claims 1, 3-10, 18, 20-27 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos et al. ("Bezos"). The Examiner has finally rejected claims 2 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bezos in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,492 to Presler-Marshall ("Presler-Marshall"). Applicants submit that finality of the rejection is improper and further that the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination with one another, do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention.

The Examiner has finally rejected claims 1-10, 18-27, and 35-37 in the Office Action mailed December 17, 2003, stating that Applicants' amendment necessitated a new grounds of rejection (See Office Action, page 6, paragraph 8). The finality of the rejection is entirely improper because independent claims 1 and 18 have not been amended and include features that are not disclosed by Bezos. Accordingly, the finality of the rejection must be withdrawn.

In an Office Action mailed May 2, 2003, the Examiner applied Bezos to only certain features of claims 1 and 18 and ignored other features of these claims (See Office Action 5/2/03, pp 2-3). During the Examiner Interview on October 21, 2003, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 included "conditional limitations and claim language" that allowed certain claim features to be ignored. As set forth in a Response filed on November 3, 2003, Applicant argued that it was improper for the Examiner to ignore these features of claims 1 and 18.

Apparently, the Examiner agrees as he has now alleged that the features of claims 1 and 18 that he previously ignored are now disclosed by Bezos. However, as

set forth in Applicants' previous response, Bezos does not disclose these features of claims 1 and 18. Specifically with respect to claim 1, Bezos does not disclose "determining whether a combined address satisfies a particular condition" and "substituting a portion of the combined address when the combined address does not satisfy the particular condition."

Apparently, the Examiner relies on Figs. 6 and 10a of Bezos to disclose these features of claim 1. Figs. 6 and 10a merely appear to be renderings of web pages. Neither of these figures discloses "determining whether a combined address satisfies a particular condition" or "substituting a portion of the combined address when the combined address does not satisfy the particular condition." Furthermore, the portions of the specification of Bezos that describe these figures are silent with regard to "determining whether a combined address satisfies a particular condition" and "substituting a portion of the combined address when the combined address does not satisfy the particular condition." For at least this reason, claim 1 is not anticipated by Bezos.

Claims 10, 18, 27, and 35-37 includes features similar to those described above with regard to claim 1 and are likewise not anticipated by Bezos. Dependent claims 2-9 and 19-26 depend from and add additional features to one of independent claims 1, 10, 18, 27, and 35-37. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, these dependent claims are not anticipated by Bezos.

With regard to claims 2 and 19, Presler-Marshall does not make up for the deficiencies of Bezos set forth above with regard to claims 36 and 37. Thus, the combination of Bezos and Presler-Marshall does not teach and/or suggest the features of claims 2 and 19. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2 and 19 are patentable over Bezos and Presler-Marshall.

Customer Number
29315

Application Serial No.: 09/747,666
Attorney Docket No.: 24122-381
Reply and Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116


CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: March 17, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Customer Number
29315

Rick A. Toering
Registration No.: 43,195
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO P.C.
12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
703-464-4806